

Amendment

Applicant: Cynthia L. Martin et al.

Serial No.: 10/692,375

Filed: October 22, 2003

Docket No.: 200208380-1

Title: TRAY ACCESS LOCK

REMARKS

This Amendment modifies the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed herewith.

With this Amendment, claims 14-29, 42-44, and 47-49 have been cancelled without prejudice, claims 53-56 have been added, and claims 1, 12, 30, 40, 45, 46, and 52 have been amended to clarify Applicant's invention.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 30, 34-41, 45, 46, and 50-56, therefore, remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 30-41, 45-46, and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hasegawa U.S. Patent No. 5,534,974. [*Applicant notes that claims 31-33 were previously cancelled.*]

With this Amendment, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the method of limiting access to a media tray includes **"defining a target pass code associated with a media tray of a network device by selecting the media tray and receiving the target pass code from a user via a user interface associated with the network device,"** and **"restricting access to the media tray to print jobs having a job pass code corresponding with the target pass code."**

With this Amendment, independent claim 30 has been amended to clarify that the instructions are executable by the processor to **"define a target pass code associated with a media tray of a network device by receiving a selection of the media tray and entry of the target pass code from a user via a user interface associated with the network device,"** and **"restrict access to the media tray to print jobs accompanied by a job pass code having a predefined relationship with the target pass code."**

With this Amendment, independent claim 45 has been amended to clarify that the method of limiting access to a media tray includes **"defining a target pass code associated with a media tray of a network device by sensing a characteristic of media in the media tray and automatically setting the target pass code based on the sensed characteristic,"** and **"restricting access to the media tray to print jobs having a job pass code that corresponds with the target pass code."**

Amendment

Applicant: Cynthia L. Martin et al.

Serial No.: 10/692,375

Filed: October 22, 2003

Docket No.: 200208380-1

Title: TRAY ACCESS LOCK

With respect to the Hasegawa reference, Applicant submits that this reference does not disclose a method of limiting access to a media tray as claimed in independent claim 1 including, amongst other things and in the combination recited, defining a target pass code associated with a media tray of a network device by selecting the media tray and receiving the target pass code from a user via a user interface associated with the network device, does not disclose a storage device readable by a processor, tangibly embodying instructions executable by the processor as claimed in independent claim 30 to, amongst other things and in the combination recited, define a target pass code associated with a media tray of a network device by receiving a selection of the media tray and entry of the target pass code from a user via a user interface associated with the network device, and does not disclose a method of limiting access to a media tray as claimed in independent claim 45 including, amongst other things and in the combination recited, defining a target pass code associated with a media tray of a network device by sensing a characteristic of media in the media tray and automatically setting the target pass code based on the sensed characteristic.

The Hasegawa reference provides that "[t]he controller 100 assigns an identification (ID) to each user so as to discriminate between a plurality of users" (col. 4, lines 21-22) or that "[t]he controller 100 may instead be connected to a network system having a server which assigns an ID to each of the users connected to the network system" (col. 4, lines 25-28). Furthermore, the Hasegawa reference provides that during the routine, "it is determined whether or not the registered occupying user ID coincides with the tray selection ID included in the job instruction" (col. 5, lines 12-14; see S12 in Figs. 4-7).

Thus, to the extent the Examiner considers the "registered occupying user ID" of the Hasegawa reference to be a target pass code, as recited in Applicant's independent claims 1, 30, and 45, and considers the "tray-selection ID" (added to a head of job data or included in the job instruction) of the Hasegawa reference to be a job pass code, as recited in Applicant's independent claims 1, 30, and 45, Applicant notes that the "registered occupying user ID" of the Hasegawa reference is *assigned by the controller* or *assigned by a server* of a network system to which the controller is connected. As such, Applicant submits that the Hasegawa reference does not disclose defining a target pass code associated with a media tray of a network device by selecting the media tray and receiving the target pass code from a user via a user interface associated with the network device or by receiving a selection of the media

Amendment

Applicant: Cynthia L. Martin et al.

Serial No.: 10/692,375

Filed: October 22, 2003

Docket No.: 200208380-1

Title: TRAY ACCESS LOCK

tray and entry of the target pass code from a user via a user interface associated with the network device, as recited in Applicant's independent claims 1 and 30, and does not disclose defining a target pass code associated with a media tray of a network device by sensing a characteristic of media in the media tray and automatically setting the target pass code based on the sensed characteristic, as recited in Applicant's independent claim 45.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 30, and 45, and the dependent claims depending therefrom, are each patentably distinct from the Hasegawa reference and, therefore, are each in a condition for allowance. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 30, 34-41, 45, 46, and 50-56 be allowed.

Amendment

Applicant: Cynthia L. Martin et al.
Serial No.: 10/692,375
Filed: October 22, 2003
Docket No.: 200208380-1
Title: TRAY ACCESS LOCK

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 30, 34-41, 45, 46, and 50-56 are all in a condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia L. Martin et al.,

By,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2006
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: AUG. 14, 2009
SAL:skh

/SCOTT LUND/
Scott A. Lund
Reg. No. 41,166